4. TOOLBOX GUIDELINES

This section provides guidance on selecting the most appropriate neighborhood traffic management measure for a specific problem. This involves narrowing the toolbox of neighborhood traffic management measures to those that will most closely target the key traffic issue; are appropriate for the type of location concerned; and are compatible with the traffic volumes, geometrics, and adjacent land uses near the given location. When the list has been narrowed, devices should be considered that are likely supported by affected residents. Finally, the selected devices need to be placed in a manner that will produce the desired results.

GUIDELINES

Traffic Related Concern

The first task when selecting the most appropriate traffic calming device is to narrow the field of devices to those that address the primary traffic concern. The most common traffic related concerns are:

- Speeding motor vehicle speeds are too high
- Traffic Volumes motor vehicle usage levels (all trips or non-local trips only) are too high
- Vehicle Safety motor vehicle speeds or volumes create an inordinate level of risk

Each device in the toolbox is appropriate to a different subset of the above traffic-related concerns. Table 1 summarizes the appropriateness of each device.

Non-Physical Measures – The first solutions to consider should be Non-Physical Measures, such as signs and markings, since these can devices increase driver awareness and are relatively inexpensive.

Speed Control Measures

Speed control measures can address any of the major problem types:

- Narrowing Measures Narrowing devices, such as neckdowns, center island narrowings, or chokers, are less obtrusive than other devices and can be more aesthetically pleasing if residents opt to fund upgraded landscaping.
- Horizontal Measures Horizontal deflection devices, such as chicanes and traffic circles, are more
 intrusive but also more effective than narrowings because they force vehicles to navigate horizontally
 around physical objects. Residents can also elect to fund upgraded landscaping.
- Vertical Measures Vertical deflection devices provide the greatest speed reduction, and consequently have the greatest potential to slow emergency response vehicles, buses, and trucks. Therefore, the placement of these devices should be carefully considered, especially to limit any potential impact on emergency vehicles or transit access.

Volume Control Measures

If speed-control measures fail to produce desired results, then diversion measures, such as street closures or forced turns may be considered. These devices redirect traffic to an adjacent street, and, therefore, should be considered after all other measures fail to produce the desired results. Volume control measures limit through

Final Report Placer County Neighborhood Traffic Management Program

traffic or turning movements at specific locations for both residents and non-residents. The full effect of the traffic diversion should be investigated before device implementation.

Location Type

The appropriate device for a given problem is a function of the location (midblock or at an intersection). Special consideration should be given to streets used by the Fire Department as primary response routes when responding to emergencies.

Table 2 indicates the location(s) where each type of traffic calming measure is applicable.

Street Classification, Location, and Other Constraints

The third step in determining the most appropriate device is to consider how each device is compatible with the street classification, traffic volumes, posted speeds, and special roadway users. Table 3 illustrates where each device is appropriate with certain constraints.

TABLE 1 APPLICABILITY OF TREATMENTS BY TRAFFIC RELATED CONCERN											
	Type of Traffic Related Concern										
Types of Measures		Speeding	Traffic Volume	Vehicle Collisions	Pedestrian Safety	Noise					
Non-l	Physical Control Measures										
	Targeted Speed Enforcement	•	0	•	_	_					
	Speed Radar Trailer	•	0	0	0	_					
	Speed Feedback Sign	•	0	0	0	_					
	Centerline/Edgeline Lane Striping	•	0	0	0	0					
	Optical Speed Bars	_	0	0	0	0					
	Signage	•	_	_	0	0					
	Speed Legend	•	0	0	0	0					
	Centerline Botts Dots	0	0	•	_	0					
	High Visibility Cross Walks	_	0	0	•	0					
	Angled Parking	•		0	0	0					
Spee	d Control – Narrowing Measures		_								
-pcc	Neckdown/Bulbout	•		0	•	0					
	Center Island Narrowing/			_	_						
	Pedestrian Refuge	•	•	•	•	0					
	Two-Lane Choker	•		0	0	0					
	One-Lane Choker	•		0	0	0					
Snee	d Control - Horizontal Measures				-						
Opoo	Traffic Circle	•		•	_	0					
	Roundabout (Single-Lane)	_		•	0	•					
	Chicane	•		0	0	0					
	Lateral Shift	_		0	0	0					
	Realigned Intersection	_		•	0	0					
Spee	d Control – Vertical Measures				J						
эроо	Speed Hump		•	_	_	×					
	Speed Lump	•		_	_	×					
	Speed Cushion	•	•	-	-	×					
	Speed Table	•		-	-	×					
	Raised Crosswalk	•			•	×					
	Raised Intersection	•	Ť		•	×					
	Textured Pavement	 	0	0	_	×					
	Rumble Strips		0	0	0	×					
Volur	me Control Measures										
v Olul	Full Closure			0	0	0					
	Partial Closure			0	0	0					
	Diagonal Diverter	•		0	0	0					
	Median Barrier	0			0	0					
	Forced Turn Island	0		_	0	0					
Key:	■ = Strongly Appropriate			opriate/Counter	_						
	= Moderately Appropriate		○ = Indiffer	ent							

ype of Measure M		Intersection	Study Perimeter	Collectors*	Transit Routes	
on-Physical Control Measure	es					
Targeted Speed	•	•	•	•	•	
Enforcement Radar Trailer						
Speed Feedback Sign						
Centerline/Edgeline Lane	_	•	_			
Striping	•	×	×	•	•	
Optical Speed Bars	•	×	×	•	•	
Signage	•	•	•	•	•	
Speed Legend	•	•	•	•	•	
Centerline Botts Dots	On Curves	×	×	•	•	
High Visibility Crosswalks	•	Unsignalized Intersections	Unsignalized Intersections	•	•	
Angled Parking	•	×	×	•	0	
peed Control - Narrowing Me	easures					
Neckdown/Bulbout	×	•	•	•	•	
Center Island Narrowing/ Pedestrian Refuge	•	•	•	•	•	
Two-Lane Choker	•	×	×	×	•	
One-Lane Choker	•	×	×	×	×	
peed Control – Horizontal Me						
Traffic Circle	×	•	0	•	•	
Roundabout (Single-Lane)	×	0	0	•	•	
Chicane	•	×	×	•	•	
Lateral Shift Realigned Intersection	×	V Unsignalized	V Unsignalized	•	•	
peed Control – Vertical Meas	ruroc	Intersections	Intersections			
Speed Hump	eures	×	×	×	×	
Speed Lump	•	×	×	0	•	
Speed Cushion	•	×	×	0	•	
Speed Table	•	×	×	0	0	
Raised Crosswalk	•	0	0	0	0	
Raised Intersection	×	•	•	0	0	
Textured Pavement	•	•	•	•	•	
Rumble Strips	•	•	0	•	•	
olume Control Measures						
Full Closure	×	•	•	×	X	
Partial Closure	×	•	•	•	•	
Diagonal Diverter	×	•	×	×	×	
Median Barrier	×	0	•	×	×	
Forced Turn Island ey: * Due to Emergency Respo	×	0		0	0	

	TAB	-							
APPLICABILITY BY STREET TYPE Roadway Classification									
Types of Measures	Local	Collector	Other Considerations						
Non-Physical Control Measures		0000.0							
Targeted Speed Enforcement									
Radar Trailer									
Speed Feedback Sign	No								
Centerline/Edgeline Lane Striping									
Optical Speed Bars	No Limitations with re	espect to ADT or Speed	None						
Signage]								
Speed Legend	1								
Centerline Botts Dots			Not applicable on snow removal routes above 2,000 feet						
High Visibility Crosswalks			,						
Angled Parking		≥48 feet: Speed Limit O mph	None						
Speed Control - Narrowing Measur									
Neckdown/Bulbout			Niet englischie						
Center Island Narrowing/ Pedestrian Refuge	ADT ≤ 20.000:	Speed Limit ≤ 35	Not applicable on snow removal routes above 2,000 feet						
Two-Lane Choker	,,,,,,		Requires provisions on snow removal routes						
One-Lane Choker	ADT ≤ 3,000; Speed Limit ≤ 30	No	DPW must review sight distance. Not applicable on snow removal routes above 2,000 feet						
Speed Control – Horizontal Measur	es								
Traffic Circle		ne <10,000; Speed Limit 5 mph	Grades ≤ 4%						
Roundabout (Single-Lane)	No	Daily Entering Volume <16,000; Speed Limit ≤ 45 mph	Requires provisions on snow removal routes						
Chicane	No	ADT \leq 5,000; Speed Limit \leq 35	 Grades ≤ 8% Requires provisions on snow removal routes 						
Lateral Shift	No	ADT ≤ 20,000; Speed Limit ≤ 35	Not applicable on snow removal routes above 2,000 feet						
Realigned Intersection	Daily Entering Volun ≤ 3:	ne <5,000; Speed Limit 5 mph	Requires provisions on snow removal routes						
Speed Control – Vertical Measures									
Speed Hump	ADT	<3,000;	- Crades < 90/						
Speed Lump		<3,000, mit ≤ 30mph	Grades ≤ 8%Not applicable on snow						
Speed Cushion	•	•	removal routes above						
Speed Table ¹	ADT<7,500: Speed I	Limit >25 mph and ≤ 35	2,000 feet						
Raised Crosswalk	n	2,000 1000							
Raised Intersection	No								
Textured Pavement ²	No	Yes	Noise impact to adjacent residential units						
Rumble Strips ²	Yes	Yes	Noise impact to adjacent residential units						
Notes: ¹ Not appropriate for streets v	without curbs, gutter, or e limited to locations wh	sidewalks. here noise impacts would	be minimal.						

Table 3 (continued) Applicability by Street Type								
Types of Measures	Roadway Classification							
Types of Measures	Local	Collector	Other Considerations					
Volume Control Measures								
Full Closure		No	Requires provisions on snow removal routes					
Partial Closure	≥ 25% non-	-local traffic.						
Diagonal Diverter	Evaluation should	d be conducted to	Not applicable on snow removal					
Median Barrier	determine	e effects of	routes above 2,000 feet					
Forced Turn Island	diverted traffic to	alternate routes						

EFFECTIVENESS COMPARISON

When more than one traffic calming device is available, it is helpful to understand the levels of effectiveness for each device to better determine which device will have the greatest effect in meeting the specified objective(s). Table 4 summarizes the effectiveness data (including excluded devices) that has been compiled for each of the neighborhood traffic management measures in the toolbox. These data are averages and the actual effectiveness will vary based on site-specific circumstances, such as proximity to major roads and the availability of alternate routes.

PLACING THE NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Strategies for the specific placement of devices differ depending on whether the concern is speed-control, volume-control, or safety related. The placement of devices is described below.

Placing Speed-Control Measures

Where feasible, neighborhood traffic management measures should be spaced in such a way to achieve the following two design speeds:

- Slow-Point 85th Percentile Design Speed: the speed that 85 percent of vehicles are traveling less than, when they are crossing a neighborhood traffic management device; the target slow-point speed is defined as 5 mph below the posted speed limit.
- Midpoint 85th Percentile Design Speed: the speed that 85 percent of vehicles are traveling less
 than, when they are halfway between a traffic calming device or other roadway feature that requires
 significant slowing (e.g., stop sign or curve). The target midpoint speed is defined as 5 mph above the
 posted speed limit.

Figure 3 illustrates how to estimate the midpoint speed.

				TA	BLE 4							
	QUANTITATIVE IM	PACTS	OF NE			RAFFIC I	MANAGE	MENT N	/IEASU	JRES		
		Effectiveness										
Types of Measures		85 th Percentile Change				Vehicles Per Day		Average Annual Collisions				
		Before	After	Change	Percent Change	Change	Percent Change	Before	After	Change	Percent Change	
Non-Physical Measures												
	All Non-Physical			Lir	nited Effe	rtiveness	as stand a	alone dev	vice			
	Measures				inted Line	1	as staria t	ione ac	VICC			
Speed C	Control – Vertical Measu	ires		.,_			-			./5		
	Entry Feature			I/D			/D			I/D		
	Speed Hump	35.0	27.4	-7.6	-22%	-355	-18%	2.62	2.29	-0.33	-13%	
	Speed Lump						eed hump					
	Speed Cushion ¹	hu	ımp but		-14%	Comparable to speed hump but I/D						
	Split Speed Hump	37	32	-5	-14%	I,	/D	I/D				
	Speed Table Raised Crosswalk	36.7	30.1	-6.6	-18%	-415	-12%	6.71	3.66	-3.05	-45%	
	Raised Intersection	34.6	34.3	-0.3	-1%		•	Ineffe	ctive	•	•	
	Rumble Strips				I/D aı	nd Limited	d Effective	ness				
	Textured Pavement			Lir	nited Effec	ctiveness	as stand a	and alone device				
Speed C	Control – Narrowing Mea	asures										
	Neckdown/Bulbout											
	Center Island	34.9	32.3	-2.6	-7%	-293	-10%					
	Narrowing	34.9	32.3	-2.0	-170	-293	-10%			I/D		
	Two-Lane Choker											
	One-Lane Choker		I/D		-14%	I/D	-20%					
Speed C	Control – Horizontal Mea											
	Traffic Circle	34.2	30.3	-3.9	-11%	-293	-5%	2.19	0.64	-1.55	-71%	
	Roundabout (Single-Lane)	Insi	gnifican	t Speed E	Effects		nificant e Effects	Not Recorded to -			-15% to - 33%	
	Chicane				I/D au	nd Limited Effectiveness					33 /0	
	Lateral Shift	I/D and Limited Effectiveness										
	Realigned	Ineffective										
	Intersection			I/D		I/D		I/D				
Volume	Control Measures											
	Full Closure	I/D	I/D	I/D	I/D	-671	-44%			I/D		
	Partial Closure	32.3	26.3	-6.0	-19%	-1,611	-42%			I/D		
	Diagonal Diverter	29.3	27.9	-1.4	-4%	-501	-35%	1		I/D		
	Median Barrier			1				1				
	Forced Turn Island	I/D				1/0		I/D				
	Turn-Movement				I/D	/U						
	Restrictions											
Stop Sig												
	Stop Signs			I/D		I,	/D			I/D		
Notes: Source:	I/D = Insufficient Data Traffic Calming State-o	f-the Pra	actice (E	Ewing, 19	99)							
	¹ City of Portland, Rubb	er Spee	d Bump	Researc	h, 1995							

Figure 3 Estimating Midpoint Speed

In mathematical terms, the following exponential function gives the relationship between midpoint speed and spacing of slow points:

```
85^{th}_{midpoint \, (mph)} = 85^{th}_{slow \, point \, (mph)} + (85^{th}_{street \, (mph)} - 85^{th}_{slow \, point \, (mph)}) * 0.56 * (1 - e^{-0.004 * spacing \, (ft.)}) where; 85^{th}_{midpoint} = resulting \, 85^{th}_{percentile \, speed \, at \, midpoint \, after \, treatment;} 85^{th}_{slow \, point} = estimated \, 85^{th}_{percentile \, speed \, at \, the \, slow \, point \, after \, treatment;} 85^{th}_{street} = 85^{th}_{percentile \, speed \, of \, street \, before \, treatment;} spacing = distance \, in \, feet \, between \, two \, devices.
```

When placing speed-control measures, use the above formula to test proposed spacings to determine whether the estimated midpoint speeds would meet the targeted midpoint speed.

Example (speed humps on street with starting speed of 32 mph):

Where spacing is 350 feet:

```
85^{th}_{midpoint \, (mph)} = 15 \, mph + ((32 \, mph - 15 \, mph) * 0.56 * (1 - e^{-0.004} * 350 \, feet))
85^{th}_{midpoint \, (mph)} = \underline{22 \, mph}
Where spacing is 750 feet:
85^{th}_{midpoint \, (mph)} = 15 \, mph + ((32 \, mph - 15 \, mph) * 0.56 * (1 - e^{-0.004} * 750 \, feet))
85^{th}_{midpoint \, (mph)} = \underline{24 \, mph}
```

The spacing of neighborhood traffic management measures directly affects the midpoint speeds: the farther apart they are, the higher the midpoint speed. In general, speed control measures placed 350 to 750 feet from another slow-point can result in speed reductions similar to those indicated in Table 4. Measures placed at intervals of less that 350 feet can become a nuisance to drivers, and measures placed greater than 750 feet apart decrease the ability to slow speeds to the target midpoint speed. In addition, vertical measures should be place a minimum of 250 feet from an adjacent intersection.

Placing Volume-Control Measures

Neighborhood traffic management devices intended to divert traffic can be located either external or internal to the neighborhood.

- Gateway Measures Volume-control measures placed at entrances or gateways to neighborhoods
 can be more effective in reducing volumes because drivers encounter these devices upon entering a
 neighborhood, which may deter future use. However, these measures can also cause local traffic to
 take more circuitous paths than internal measures would.
- Internal Measures When placed within a neighborhood, measures have a less direct effect on non-local traffic. First-time attempts to travel through the neighborhood will occur more frequently, and drivers will seek alternative routes within the neighborhood. However, this type of placement can cause less of an inconvenience to local traffic.

Final Report Placer County Neighborhood Traffic Management Program

Placing Safety Measures

The placement of safety-oriented neighborhood traffic management devices is dependent on the particulars of the traffic-related concern and on the characteristics of the selected neighborhood traffic management device. For example, if the traffic related concern involves pedestrian safety, then the solution—a raised crosswalk, for example—should be placed at a location where it is likely to be heavily used by pedestrians.